Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have introduced is based upon my 22 years experience in Congress, very careful study of our entire immigration program and testimony given during the 20 days of hearings before Subcommittee No. 1 on pending immigration legislation, including H.R. 7700.

Our hearings began on June 11, 1964, and they are continuing according to the schedule set and announced on June 1, 1964. We have completed testimony from interested Members of Congress. We have completed testimony from the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Labor. We have completed testimony from the operating level of the Department of Justice, including the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. We have taken testimony on 2 days from the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, and I regret to announce that testimony is neither satisfactory nor complete.

Because of scheduled commitments to take testimony from interested non-Government organizations and individual citizens, we opened that phase of our hearings on August 5, 1964, and we will continue those hearings until we have heard as many witnesses as time will permit. Let me say, in this connection, that we have had thoughtful and informative testimony, both pro and con, from this healthy wellspring of citizen opinion.

Our hearings to date reveal there is great disagreement about what our immigration policy is or ought to be. Testimony in support of H.R. 7700 has been inconclusive, in some important respects, conflicting and uncertain. It is apparent that Congress will require studies, investigations, and public hearings in depth to weld an immigration policy and supporting laws which serve the domestic needs and international commitments of our Nation.

That is a primary responsibility of Congress which must be discharged. Congress provided the mechanism by law to discharge that responsibility when it established the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy in 1952. It is time Congress provided the funds necessary for the joint committee to discharge its responsibilities. The obvious alternative is continuing conflict over what our immigration policy is, in fact, and what it ought to be, along with the present open invitation for the executive branch of Government to seek the authority in this field which Congress is unwilling to exercise. Let me make it clear that I am dedicated to maintaining the separation of powers upon which our representative form of government is based. I do not point a finger of accusation at the executive branch of our Government because I understand fully that when a vacuum of authority exists someone always moves in to fill it. My single purpose is and has been to put Congress in a position where it can discharge its constitutional authority as well as its unquestioned responsibility for regulating immigration into the United States.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have introduced is a very modest proposal. The overwhelming weight of testimony taken before Subcommittee No. 1 to date supports it. Our heritage as well as our commonsense supports it. It is not a panacea for all the problems and disagreements which afflict our immigration program. But it does provide a reasonable remedy to three major problems and the opportunity for Congress to observe some of the basic principles of H.R. 7700 in practice for a 2-year trial period, during which Congress undertakes a full and objectvie review of all the factors upon which a sound national immigration policy must be based.

CARIBBEAN CRISIS: CONTINUING STORM SIGNS DEMAND ACTION AGAINST FURTHER PERILS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the poet, Thomas Campbell, in "Lochiel's Warning," makes this significant statement: "Coming events cast their shadows before." The truth of this saying has been amply illustrated by a succession of crucial occurrences on the Isthmus of Panama. Clearly foreseen and repeatedly predicted by me in addresses to the Congress, these forecasts gave timely warnings to proper authorities of what subsequently culminated; but whatever satisfaction there may be in having been right, the outcome is, indeed, barren.

The Red-led and directed Panamanian mob assaults on the Canal Zone on January 9–12, 1964, encouraged and facilitated by officials of the Red-infiltrated government of Panama, were the inevitable consequences of what had preceded and could have been anticipated by anyone who made the effort to collect facts and to evaluate the evidence. Moreover, they could have been entirely avoided had the legislative and executive branches of our Government taken timely preventive action as they should have done.

Denied vital information on Isthmian developments over a long period of time, the people of our country were naturally shocked by the sanguinary violence that featured the Panamanian outbreak. Now, Mr. Speaker, they have learned that, subsequent to the attack, newsstories in the major press organs of the United States purporting to relate events of the outbreak were slanted. The result is that growing numbers of our citizens are holding the Department of State accountable for the series of betrayals affecting the Panama Canal, which, over many years, have plagued those charged with responsibility for the efficient maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of this key artery of interoceanic commerce.

In view of the publication on June 9, 1964, of the report of the onsite investigation of the January 1964 Panamanian mob assaults by the International Commission of Jurists of Geneva, Switzerland, and its inclusion in an address to this body on June 11 by the distinguished chairman of the Panama Canal Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], important facts about the riots, as found by a neutral body, are now available—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1964, pages 13085–13094. To undo some of the harm inflicted by the mendacious propaganda that characterized most of the publicity following the outbreak, it is still the duty of the press of our country to present all the facts forthrightly and fearlessly. Any representative of the press who wishes to see pictorial evidence of some of the destruction of American-owned property in the Canal Zone and in Panama during the January 1964 disorders can examine a stack of photographs on a desk in my office. Those who seek additional information from the documentation on the background can get a start by reading my addresses on March 9, 1964, "Panama Canal: Focus of Power Politics"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 9, 1964, pages 4536–4548—on May 5, "Under Two Flags: Blunders, Confusion, and Chaos at Panama"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 5, 1964, pages 9718–9725—and correlated statements by many other Members of the Congress.

THE 1959 PROGRAM FOR CARIBBEAN SECURITY GAVE TIMELY WARNING

Mr. Speaker, in order to provide necessary perspective for comments to be made later in this address, let us recall proceedings in the Congress in 1959, the year of the Red takeover of Cuba. By that time, the trend of subsequent events in the long-range program for Red conquest of the strategic Caribbean, through the processes of infiltration, subversion, and violence, were clear to any discerning observer of the world revolutionary movement known as the international Communist conspiracy.

In an effort to supply a remedy for meeting the mounting crisis, protecting our vital interests in the Caribbean, and assuring the safety of the Western Hemisphere, I suggested a five-point policy program for our Government. This was outlined in an address by me on August 24, 1959, at Reading, Pa., on "Storm Clouds Over the Caribbean."—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 26, 1959, page 17062.

In view of what later transpired and the crucial situation now facing our country to the south of us, I repeat the 1959 policy program then advocated and proposed as a plan of action for our agencies of Government. Let me repeat now from my 1959 proposals:

First, announcement that the Monroe Doctrine applies to communistic subversion through penetration and infiltration and veiled motivation, as well as by open and direct effort.

Second, proclamation by our Government that the Canal Zone is constitutionally acquired territory of the United States and that its continued control by this Nation pursuant to treaty and the obligations thus imposed is best for all

effect upon existing trade and treaty laws, because I have indicated on many occasions my approval and support of mutual respect for and reciprocal trade with other nations, but I do not believe that this trade is of real benefit or advantage to this country when it is a "one way street," so to speak, and when it undermines American competitive standards, the prospects of the steady employment of American working men and women, and results in depressed conditions in our economy. That kind of trade, I submit, Mr. Speaker, produces nothing but grief and misfortune for millions of American people and will, if long continued, produce immeasurable deterioration and the ultimate destruction of many of our economic institutions and greatly weaken our free way of life.

I again pledge my vigorous support and wholehearted cooperation to our great shoe industry and its workers, and I hope that under the sagacious leadership of this industry, with sincere, vigorous and effective efforts by Members of Congress that action will soon be taken across the board to put an end to the augmented flow of cheap competitive, destructive imports that are causing so much concern and threaten such dire results for our economy, our Nation and the cause of freedom.

H.R. 12305—ITS PURPOSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 10, I introduced H.R. 12305, to create a selective immigration board and to provide for the allocation of authorized but unused quota numbers in accordance with the criteria established by the Congress.

The bill which I introduced is not stopgap legislation, it is not another patch on a law which is already overburdened and confused with patchwork legislation.

The bill which I introduced is directed at providing a remedy for the major problems in the immigration field which should be remedied now, before the close of this session of the 88th Congress. Those problems are:

First, reuniting families. By this I mean that citizens of the United States are separated from their parents, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters residing in foreign lands because the quota against which they would be charged is oversubscribed. Legally resident aliens of our country, awaiting the opportunity to become citizens, are separated from their husbands or wives and their unmarried sons and daughters for the same reason. Our free society is based upon the sanctity of the home and the integrity of the family. It is in our own best interests to provide a reasonable remedy to this problem which strikes at the foundations of our great society. My bill provides a remedy for this problem.

Second, meeting the need for certain skills and special talents in short supply in the United States in a manner that will help strengthen and expand our economy by helping business and industry fill these needs. The present method of meeting this need is unsatisfactory, it is not working out as intended. That method needs to be tightened up and made workable, as my bill provides.

Third, meeting the need for our country to provide an asylum for a fair share of the victims of Communist and other totalitarian persecution, under conditions which do not place the stigma of parole upon those unfortunate victims who qualify for admission to our country. Moreover, the parole provisions of the existing law were not intended to be used for this purpose. Abuses have developed in the use of parole authority which invite further abuses. It is time Congress put a stop to these abuses and dealt with the refugee problem on a forthright basis. The bill which I have introduced accomplishes both those purposes.

Those three problems which confront our Nation in the immigration field form the three preferences defined in my bill. The authorized but unused quota numbers are to be made available to meet these problems during a 2-year trial period. Let me emphasize that the bill which I have introduced does not raise the number of quota immigrants now authorized for admission during the 2-year trial period. It simply authorizes the use of those authorized quota numbers which remain unused during each of 2 years for the preference categories I have outlined.

The bill provides for a three-member selective immigration board, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. That board is responsible for developing an annual plan for the allocation of the authorized but unused quota numbers to the three preference classes I have defined. Before the plans of the board become operative they must be approved by Congress, through a provision under which either body of Congress can reject the plan within 90 days after its submission. This requirement controls each of the plans covering the 2-year trial period provided for in the bill.

It should be obvious that the board will consult with the appropriate committees of Congress before formulating their plans because failure to do so will insure congressional rejection of the proposed plan. The board is also required to submit detailed reports to Congress, covering each of the 2 years and a final report of operations under the authorizations provided for in the bill. Through this system I have provided what I believe to be a reasonable solution to a very difficult question which has arisen during the hearings on H.R. 7700. That question involves the constitutional responsibility laid upon Congress to regulate immigration into the United States, an unchallenged responsibility affirmed by the Supreme Court, and the call of H.R. 7700 to delegate those responsibilities to the executive branch of our Government. The provisions of my bill do not delegate the powers of Congress to the executive branch of our Government in any instance.

What it does, in fact, is to establish exacting criteria for allocation of unused quota numbers and calls upon the executive branch, through the selective immigration board, to recommend to Congress how those quota numbers should be distributed within the preferences set by Congress. Congress retains its final authority on the use of such unused quotas through the statutory power to reject such recommendations made by the board.

The Secretary of State is required to certify to the selective immigration board the number of authorized but unused quota numbers for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1964, and June 30, 1965. The board in turn is governed by those figures certified by the Secretary of State during the 2-year trial period ending June 30, 1967. The board is not required by law to reallocate all of the unused quota numbers during the 2-year trial period. It is required to exercise its judgment in the use of those unused quota numbers in resolving the three major problems involved in our immigration program, subject of course to final approval by Congress.

The board is also required to consult with the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor before formulating the plans for submission to Congress. This should insure that all the vital and emergent problems of the various Departments of Government are considered in formulation of the board's plan for allocation of the unused quota numbers.

That in susbtance is what the bill I have introduced will authorize and should accomplish. Now for the things the bill will not do.

First, it will not raise the present ceiling as set by law on quota immigrants.

Second, it will not replace the national origins quota system which continues without interruption during the 2-year trial period.

Third, it will not alter the eligibility or admissability requirements of the present law which govern all immigrant admission including those safeguards on security, health, moral turpitude and character of the applicants.

Fourth, it will not call for any reorganization of the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State, both organs of Government retaining their full authority and responsibility under existing law.

Fifth, it will not serve as an invitation to build a new arm of government bureaucracy because the powers of the Selective Immigration Board are limited, requiring no more than a small but competent staff to assist the Board in the discharge of its responsibilities. Since the Board and any staff connected with it will be terminated by law on October 1, 1967, the danger of planting the seeds of further bureaucratic involvement are minimized and controlled by the cutoff date.